Aldis 3916. A 5 4

VINDICATION

OF OUR

BLESSED SAVIOURS

Genealogy.

From the Cavils of Antiscripturists, and the Accounts that two Evangelists give of it; Set in so clear a Light, as may at once satisfie the well meaning Seeker, and Silence the Irreligious Disputant.

Prov. 4. Ver. 24.

Put away from thee a froward mouth, and perverse lips put far from thee.

Prov. 8 Vers. 9.

All the words of my mouth are in righteousness, there is nothing froward or perverse in them: they are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge.

Edinburgh, Printed by the Heirs and Successors of *Andrew Anderson*, Printer to His most Excellent Majesty. 1699.

To the Reader.

THE following Observations were written some Months ago, with particular regard to the satisfaction of a young Gentleman, who by his Travelling into several parts of Europe, had found too many occasions of Conversing with bad company, and was by them, tempted to an evil Opinion if the Holy Scriptures.

Too many there are in this Iron and rugged Age, who contend fiercely, and scuffle endlesly about things which (in my conscience I am perswaded) both might and ought to be managed with less heat and Concern. And though I cannot pretend to be altogether Disinterested, in these lesser Broils which conspire to render this poor Church miserable; yet I should be much ashamed if my first sally into Print did speak me one of those, who confine true Religion to

the Interests of a Party, and the Corners of a Sect, and who spend all their Zeal and Spirits on small Matters.

When the Veracity of Divine Oracles is impudently brought in question and Impugned, by the Sophistry of half thoughted Arguments, I hope the wise and Pious, will not think the design of the following Paper useless or unseasonable; If on tryal, I find that this short breathed Performance meets not with careless or unkind Reception, from those who have true Standart wit, and whose Judgement deserves to be esteemed; I shall be encouraged to render the Publick some further accounts how I am wont to spend my Time in privat, when not diverted from Study by other necessary Cares and Bussiness:

OBSERVATIONS

OBSERVATIONS

on Mat. Chap. 1. verſ. 1. 17.

WHether we confine the Title contained in theſe words (*The book of the generation of Jeſus Chriſt*) to the firſt ſeventeen *verſes* of this Chapter; or extend it to the whole Goſpel of St. *Matthew*, is a Mater of Indifferency; for no unanſwerable Reaſon can be given againſt either interpretation. If againſt the Firſt it be Objected, that a few verſes on one Column of a ſingle Page, deſerve not the Name of a book? *It* may be eaſily replyed, That ſuch a Form of ſpeaking amongſt the *Jews*, is no more uncouth, than the calling a Bill of Divorce, *Liber*, or *Libellus repudii* or that of *Jer.* 32. *v.* 11. 12, where the Evidence of a very ſmall purchaſe hath the Title alſo of a book given it. In defence of the Second, it can be told, that the word (*Generation*) doth not always relate ſimply to Birth or Genealogies; but often alſo ſignifieth, *any inanimate Production*, *any Event that time brings forth*; and ſo likewiſe the Hiſtory or relation of any ſuch Event or paſſage. Thus *Gen.* 2. 4. is to be underſtood, not only the Creation of the Heavens and the Earth, but other Paſſages following: And *Gen.* 5. 1. muſt be Expounded of *Adams* Creation and following Life. So *Gen.* 37. 2. It is clear, that *Jacobs* own Birth, or Procreation of

his Children, is not the peculiar Matter in hand at the time, but his dwelling in *Canaan*, his love to *Joseph*, and the passages consequent to that, So *Numb.* 3. 1. Is meant the History of the passages of *Aaron* and *Moses*, &c. So here, not only the Birth of Christ, (for that is but a very smal part of this Book) nor yet only the Genealogie of Christ, for though that here follow immediately, yet makes it not up any considerable part of this Book, but the Book of the History of the Birth, Life, Death and Resurection of Christ, in all the Events that concern him, so far as they are Recorded by this Evangelist; as the Title of St. *Lukes* Book called *the Acts of the Apostles*, Includes, not only what they did, but also the most remarkable Occurences that happened to them, in their various Progresses for propagating the Gospel.

The design of the latter part of this Vers, is to intimat that, according to the more than once repeated, and (by the *Jews*) much remarked promises to *David*, and to *Abraham*, Jesus Christ according to the Flesh, was Lineally descended of them: This was so much in the Evangelists eye, (as a proper Argument to convince the *Jews*, that the Son of *Josephs* Spouse was the true *Messiah*) that in his whole account of our Saviours Genealogy, he observes no more strictness of full Account or Particularity of Enumeration, than was necessary to make appear, that he derived his Pedigree from those eminent Fathers already mentioned; and the due consideration of this, will be singularly usefull to reconcile the Difference of Reckonings in this Chapter, from

those

those of *Luke*. 3. *vers*. 23. 38. where the same Subject is after another manner treated of.

Before I descend to more particulars, it is fit that some things in general be Premised. As first, It is no new thing, to hear Objections proposed against the two Evangelists, as irreconcilable in this Matter; for *Celsus* and *Porphyry*, and *Julian*, did the same; and both the *Ebionite* and *Manichean* Hereticks, did on this account, Expunge the Genealogy of Christ out of the Gospel.

Secondly, though perfect and satisfactory, oral Traditions in so Intricat a Point, cannot be expected or leaned on at this distance of Time: And though the publick Tables are long ago lost, from which the Evangelists may reasonably be presumed to have drawn their Accounts, yet by many Authors accuratly Skilled in the study of antient Records, it is believed on most competent Grounds, that till the last distruction of *Jerusalem* by *Vespasian*, and the consequent total Subversion of the *Jewish* Polity, it was easie for any curious or inquisitive Person, to get punctual satisfaction in this or the like Controversies, from the *Archives* relating to those Matters, which were very exactly kept by the *Jews*, and most especially such as concerned the Genalogies of the Sons of *David*, because of their longing Expectations of the *Messiah* out of his Race.

Thirdly, as the Generality of the *Jews* were bitter Enemies to the Gospel, so they were nicely Studious, and most contentiously Critical in the matter of Genealogies: and therefore it is not to be doubted, but that if they could have found any Flaw in the Evangelists relations on this Head

they would not failed of improving it to the discredit of their whole History, but it is not pretended that they ever declared Dissatisfaction in this Point, and therefore we may assuredly conclude, that they had no plausible Ground whereon to build an Objection.

Fourtly, Its believed on good Reasons, that St, *Matthew* writ his Gospel, mainly for the use of the *Jews*; and to suppose that he had so little honesty or common sense, as to throw a Choaking or Stumbling block in the very Entrance of his History, by a blundering and false account of his Lineage, whom he would have them believe in as the true *Messiah*, is a thought which any sober person will conclude, to be very injurious & unworthy of him. Much more equitable it is, to think, that he knew he wrote nothing of our Saviours Genealogy, but what could bear the Test of a Scrutiny and Comparison with their own Authentick Records.

Vers. 2. Hath nothing remarkable in it, but the general mention of *Judas* his Brethren, together with himself, for which these probable Reasons may be given. First, *Ishmael* and *Esau*, the Brothers of *Isaac* and *Jacob*, had not such direct or immediat interest in the promised Seed, as the Sons of *Jacob*; who, with their progeny, were all of them in peculiar manner, Adopted to be the people of God.

Secondly, It was fit to recommend Jesus to all the *Israelites*, and particularly to those of the dispersed Tribes, as having some Relation according to the Flesh, to everie one of them.

Vers. 3 *Zara* is named with his Brother *Pha-*

rez,

rez, because of the remarkable Passage at their Birth, recorded *Gen.* 38. *vers.* 28 29 as if they had strove which should be the first born, and the Progenitor of Christ.

As for the mention of their Mother, It is remarkable, that in the whole reckoning of our Saviours Genealogie by the Evangelist, (besides the Blessed Virgin her self) such Women were only named for Mothers, as were either of Gentile Extract, (as *Rachel* and *Ruth*) or noted for some Criminal Guilt, as *Thamar* and *Uriahs* Wife, the one stained with Incest, and the other with Adultry : If a reason of this be asked, it is most agreeable to suppose, that such an account is a designed Prolusion to the Gospel of Christ, by which, Gentile Idolaters, and Sinners of all sorts and sizes, were to be called and converted.

Vers. 4, 5, 6. Have nothing difficult or observable in them, save that *Aram* in the *Syriack*, is the same with *Ram*, *Ruth* 4. 19. in the *Hebrew* language, and that *David* for Honours sake, is mentioned with the Title of King : for considering how tumultuary and unprosperous the choice of *Saul* was, and how regular the advancement of *David* to Royall Dignity, by the unextorted approbation, and unquestionable good pleasure of Heaven, and most agreeable to the ancient Promises in favour of *Judah's* Tribe ; It is not absurd nor amiss, to reckon the change of the *Israelitish* Government from that of Judges to Kings, from *Davids* commencing Soveraign.

Vers. 7. 8. We meet with no rub here; till we come to *Joram*, who is said to have begot *Ozias*, otherwise called *Azariah* the Son of *Amaziah*

riah, who was indeed his immediat Parent, 2 *King.* 15. 1. & 1 *Chr.* 3. 12. and himself the Son of *Joash* the Son of *Ahaziah*, the immediat Son of *Joram*; So as it is plain, that three Kings of *Judah* are here omitted, which may be accounted for by more reasons than one. As first, it is not against the received Rules of Speech, to affirm of the great Grand-father, or any distant Progenitor, that he begat the great Grand-child, or any of his far distant Off spring, as 1 *Chr.* 4. 1. compared with *chap.* 2. *vers.* 50. Secondly, (as I have already hinted) the Evangelists principal design, was to shew, that Jesus was literally descended of *David*, and to this, strict Enumeration of all Particulars was not absolutely necessary: besides it is palpable, that by dividing his account Total into three Periods, and each of these again into fourteen Generations, he had more respect to the ease of the readers memory, than the nice and less profitable satisfaction of his Curiosity, by the exact recording of every individual persons Name, which by the Laws of strick and full Computation, might have here claimed its place: he had found fourteen Generations in the first Period (from *Abraham* to *David*) and in reckoning the other two, he observes only the same number as sufficient for his intended Purpose: as to the omission of these three Kings, here *Ahaziah*, *Joash* and *Amaziah*, rather than any other three; perhaps it was intended as a Brand on their Idolatrous and Inauspicious Reigns; and in part, an Accomplishment of those Curses, which were more than once Denounced against *Ahab*, and the memory of his House,

House, for from him on the Mothers side, they derived their Pedigree, 2 *Chr.* 21. 6. And that this penal Act of Oblivion, reacheth only to the fourth Generation, is consentaneous to the Law against Idolatry, *Exod.* 20 5. Thus by some the omission of *Joab*, in the Catalogue of *Davids* Worthies, and of *Cain*, 1 *Chr.* 1: and of *Dan*, *Rev.* 7. is reckoned as a Disgrace intended them for their Crimes; but enough of this.

Vers. 9. 10. Have no difficulty nor ground for Controversy in them.

Vers. 11. Is much tossed by *Interpreters*, as having given occasion to one of *Prophyries* Objections against the Christians, because both in the Books of the *Kings* and *Chronicles*, its found, that *Jechonias* or *Coniah*, or *Jehoiachin*, (for he hath all these names given him in several places of Scripture) was only the Grand child of *Josiah*, by *Jechoiachim* or *Jechonias*, one of his four Sons, and his immediat Successor in the Kingdom. But what I said on *vers.* 8. concerning *Joram*, his begetting *Ozias*, may deserve to be considered here also; or if this seem not satisfactory here let us suppose upon the Authority of an ancient Manuscript or two, (mentioned by *Robert* and *Henry Stevens* two Famous *Printers*, and by *Faber Stapulensis*) that the ordinary Text is corrupted through the fault of careless Scriveners, and that the defect ought to be Supplyed by the Interposition of *Jechoiakim*, *Joakim* or *Eliakim*, betwixt *Josiah* and *Jechoniah*, and then the difficulty is over. But a corruption of almost all the received Copies of Scripture, (even in the least material Point) ought not lightly to be supposed, though

though (besides the Authors already named *Epiphanius*, *Parens*, *Kemnitius*, and *Maldonat* the very learned Jesuit, have recourse to it here, and though the ordinary Margents of Bibles, take notice also of this different reading; Let us then Thirdly suppose, that *vers.* 11. *Jechoniah* or *Jehoiackim* the Father is understood, and that he is competently distinguished from his Son *Jechoniah*, *vers.* 12. First, by the mention of his Brethren, whereas we read at most but of on Brother properly so called, that his Son had. Secondly that the Son *vers.* 12. is sufficiently distinguished from the Father *vers.* 11. by being said to Live and act after the Transportation of himself and many of his people, into *Babylon*; whereas the Father, *Josiah's* immediat Son and Successor. dyed at *Jerusalem*, a little before the Captivity of his Son *Jechoniah*, 1 King. 24. 6. The latter part of *vers.* 11. must be construed by way of *Antithesis*, *Opposition* or *Contra-distinction*, to the beginning of *vers.* 12. and so must signifie with some Latitude, a different Period of Time from the Transportation its self into *Babylon*, that is a little space before the Captivity, which in a few years, reached to all *Jehoiakims* Brethren: & though himself were permitted to live and die at *Jerusalem*; yet it was but a poor disgraceful Tributary, and disquieted reign he had, as one of *Nebuchadnezzars* Vassals. and next degree to Captivity. And *Jer* 22. 19. It is Propheſied, that he should have the Burial of an Ass, Drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of *Jerusalem*, and according to *Josephus*, the Enemy slew him in the City, and commanded him to be cast before

the

the Walls unburied, conform to the Prediction. *Jer.* 36. 30. where its said, *that his dead body should be cast out in the day time to the heat, and in the night to the frost.*

The general mention of his Brethren, together with himself, is, because each of them had his little turn of Soveraignty, mean and precarious as it was. *Vers.* 12. *&c.* For clearing the difficulties that occur in this, and the following Verses, I have found none that goes so judiciously and neatly to Work, as *Grotius* that great Master, both of rational Discourse, and critical Observation. some dayes ago, I had only a few hours perusal of his most learned commentaries on the Evangelists, but(if I rightly remember) this is his Method: First, he takes for granted, that the Divine Historians had both of them free Access to, and made careful use of the publick Registers, such as that mentioned, *Nehem.* 7 64. Secondly, that those Records and the remembrance of them, having long since perished, fair and probable Conjecture is the most that can be expected from, or ought to be pretended by any, that undertakes to clear the Scruples that occur on this Subject, according to the ancient saying, *Qui bene conjexit Vatem, perhibebo optimum.* Thirdly, he proves by unanswerable Reasons, that both the Evangilists Trace out *Josephs* Pedigree in different Forms: *St. Mathew* observing the Order of Legal Succession, and *St. Luke* that of natural Descent. Fourthly, he holds it plain and undoubted, that though *St. Luke* in his Retrograde Catalogue, over-leaps none of the natural Descendants; yet *St. Mathew* is not near so exact

act in his Enumeration of legal Successors. Fifthly, that to fill up all the Blanks of St. *Matthews* Reckoning, with a true account of their Names who are left out, is a thing impossible to be done at this day, as the Prophet would be very inconsiderable, though it could be performed. But so far as the Old Testament, or ancient Traditions afford Light, to place up the Reckoning, and make it run somewhat parallel to St. *Lukes*. *Grotius* makes his best use of them, and in due place, I shall set down his Tables as I Extracted them out of him, but here it will be proper to satisfie some Objections, as first. That of *Celsus* and *Julian*: To what purpose was it, to give account of *Josephs* Extract, seing he was not the Father of Christ? To this several answers may be given, As first, Christ was not dis Interested in *Josephs* Lineage, because he was born of her whom *Joseph* held in lawful Marriage by an Influence; which as it was Supernatural was also beyond question lawful, and he was educated under *Josephs* Tutelage; and by the rules of Analogy, the received Laws and Customes of the *Jews*, with Reference to Adoption, are so far Aplicable to this case, that Jesus might justly been reputed *Josephs* Heir.

Secondly, (which is cloler to the purpose) *Eusebius* and others deliver for certain, that though the Patrimony were but very small, yet *Mary* was an Heir. is as having no Brothers and the Statute *Numb* 36. 8. was positive and peremtory, that such should not Marry, but to one of Descendants of their Fathers Family that the Children of *Israel* might enjoy every one the Inheritance

inheritance of his Father. If therefore either *Joseph* or *Mary* were of *Davids* Lineage, the other behoved to be so also; and consequently the Deduction of *Davids* Line to *Joseph*, who (both by Construction of Law was the Legal, and in vulgar Belief, was reputed the Father of Christ by nature) was sufficient to prove Jesus to be the Son of *David*, according to the much regarded ancient prophecies, and the Evangelists declared Intention.

Objct, 2. Its the question of every Reader, why does St. *Mathew* reckon from *Solomon*, and St. *Luke* from his Brother *Nathan*? To this its Answered, that only *Solomon* and his Off-springs had the right of Succession to *Davids* Kingdom, till their Line failed in *Jechoniah*, who was first succeeded by his Uncle *Zedekiah*; afterwards by *Assir*, (as *Grotius* sets it) and then by *Salathiel* the Natural Son of *Neri*, one of *Nathans* Posterity; in *Lukes* Roll, the by reason of his Right of Legal Succession, Listed both here, & 1 *Chr.* 3. 17. as Son to *Jechoniah*, which *Grotius* takes hold of, as a special Argument, to prove, that *Mathew* follows the right of Succession, and *Luke* the Order of natural Descent.

Objct. 3 How can *Zorobabel* be the Son of *Salathiel*, seing 1 *Chron.* 3. 19. he is called the Son of *Pedaiah*. To this I Answer, that both *Ezra* Cap. 5. *vers.* 2. and *Haggai* Cap. 1. *vers.* 1. call the great *Zerubabel*, who is here meant, the Son of *Salathiel*, which together with the different Names of his Sons, who is named 1 *Chron.* 3. is sufficient Argument to make it very credible, that *Zorobabel* there spoken of, (however he might be of

the

the Blood-Royal, was not the person here mentioned.

In clearing the Difficulties that occurr betwixt *Zerobabel*, and *Joseph* the Husband of *Mary*, we must be beholden to Tradition, so far as it pretends to give us Light, and thus the account shall run. The Line of *Abiud*, (as eldest Son and Heir to *Zerobabel*) is followed by St. *Mathew* without Omission or Interruption, (as *Grotius* supposes) till we come to *Eleazar* and after him he reckons seven Generations over-leapt, till we come to *Matthan*, who (according to a very antient Tradition, Recorded by *Africanus* a writer in the primitive days of Christianity) died without any Children by his Wife *Estha*, so that in him *Abiuds* Line failed: But according to the Law and Custom of the *Jews*, the Marriage of the Childless Widow, became due to him who was Prince, or Chief of the next or second family, that he might raise seed for preserving the Name and Memory of the Dead: and thus *Melchi* the Descendant of *Rhesa*, *Zerobabels* younger Son, became the Second Husband of *Estha*, and had by her three Sons *Jacob*, called also *Panther*, (according to a Tradition mentioned by *Epiphanius*, and hinted at both by *Celsus* and some *Jewish* Writers) from his natural Fathers Sirname, though in Construction of Law, he were the Son and Heir of the deceased *Matthan*: *Eli* the second, *Levi* the third Son. *Eli* begat *Joseph*, who by the death of *Jacob* his Fathers elder Brother without Children, and (it seems) without Marriage; or else his Wife being past the Age of Bearing before he died, or dead before himself, so as there was no place for raising

up

up Seed to him by any near Kinſman, became Heir to him, and upon the account of ſucceſſion to his Inheritance, was his Son in the Stile of Law, and ſo he had at once his Uncle *Jacob* for his Legal, and *Eli* for his natural Father, which conciliats *Mat.* 1. 16. with *Luk* 3. 23. *Levi* the third Son of *Melchi*, and one of *Joſephs* Uncles, begat (according to Tradition mentioned by ſome *Grecian* Writers) *Barpanther*, who begat *Panther*, who begat *Jehojakim* or *Eliakim* the Father of *Mary Joſephs* ſpouſe : thus the ſame *Levi* was *Joſephs* Uncle, and the Father of *Maries* Great Grand Father.

If according to this reckoning, it ſhall be thought that there behoved to be too great a diſproportion betwixt *Joſeph* and *Maries* Age ; Let us but ſuppoſe firſt that *Eli* was ſixty years when he begat *Joſeph*, and *Joſeph* fourty one when he Eſpouſed *Mary*; Let us ſuppoſe next, that *Levi* was ten years younger than his Brother *Eli*, and ſo but fifty when *Joſeph* was born. Secondly, that at twenty he begat *Barpanther*, that is thirty years before *Joſephs* Birth. Thirdly, that *Barpanther* begat *Panther* about the twentieth year of his Age, that is ten years before *Joſephs* Birth. Fourthly, that *Panther* begat *Eliakim* at 18, when *Joſeph* was eight years old. Fifthly, that *Eliakim* begat *Mary* at 18, and ſo *Joſeph* was aged 26 when *Mary* was born. Sixthly, that *Mary* was 15 at the time of her Eſpouſals, which (if I rightly remember) is the age aſſigned her by *Baronius*, and other Eccleſiaſtick Writers, according to this Reckoning, *Joſeph* was 41 years at the time of his Marriage. None of the fore-named Suppoſitions

are

are impossible or hard to be granted; and that the justness of the whole account may be more easily comprehended at one view, I set down the following Tables.

Eli 30	*Levi* 20	*Barpanther* 1.			
Eli 50	*Levi* 40	*Barpanther* 20	*Panther* 1		
Eli 68	*Joseph* 8	*Panther* 20	*Eliakim* 1		
Joseph 26		*Eliakim* 18	*Mary* 1		
Joseph 41	*Mary* 15				

Vers. 17. After what hath been already said, Doctor *Hammonds* Paraphrase on *vers.* 17. is sufficient to explain it thus: the Genealogie here set down, not by Enumeration of all the severall which Succeeded on another from *Abraham* to *David*, may for Memories sake, be divided into three Fourteens: one of those from *Abraham* to *David* before they were Kings: a Second from *David* to the Captivity, whilst they enjoyed the Regal power intire: the third from the Captivity to Christ, when there were only some weak Remainders of the Regal Power among the *Jews*,

OBSERVATIONS

OBSERVATIONS *on* Luke 3. *v.* 24. 36. & 38.

BOth the Evangeliſts have the ſame Deſign, and the ſame Subject, but differ in the manner of handling it. St. *Matthew* follows the order of Legal Succeſſion, and therefore he reckons from *Solomon*, and tho his natural Line failled about the time of the Captivity, yet the Succeſſion was keeped up by another Branch of *Davids* Family, to wit, *Nathans* poſterity, who becoming *Solomons* Heirs by the Legal Right, now divolved on them through the defect of his own natural off-ſpring, are without any Scruple reckoned by the Evangeliſts for *Solomons* true *Progenie*, becauſe ſuch they were, indeed in conſtruction of Law, thus *Jechoniah* is ſaid to beget *Salathiel*: Again, tho *Zorobabels* Lineage, Branched it ſelf into two by his ſons *Abiud* and *Rheſa*, and tho *Abiuds* Line failed in *Matthan*, yet becauſe the Succeſſion was keeped up by the Poſterity of *Rheſa* the younger Brother, he reckons from *Abiud* the elder: and when his Line fails, Inſerts *Jacob* the natural Son of *Melchi*, as the Son of *Matthan*, becauſe he was his Heir, and *Joſeph* the natural Son of *Eli*, as the Son of *Jacob*, becauſe he became his Uncle, *Jacobs* Heir.

St. *Luke* follows the order of natural generation, in a retrograde Line, to the firſt Father of Mankind

Mankind (as writing his Gospel with speciall Respect to the Gentiles, and because Christ was promised to all Nations, *Gen* 3. 15) with such exactness, that nothing is questioned in this whole Acount; which keeps close the natural Lines, that held on without interruption: but the mention of *Matthat* and *Levi*. *vers*. 24. And of *Cainan* v. 36.

Concerning these three, *Lucas Brugensis*,) as he is Cited by the industrious Mr. *Pool*, in his *Synopsis*)tells us that *Johannes Cordesius*(an Author whom he highly values and commends) had convinced him by two dissertations on the Subject, that in the most Ancient Copies, those Names were not to be found; and to this purpose he vouches the Authority of *Irenæus*, *Africanus* *Gregory*, *Nazianzene*, *Jerome* and others. The way how they came to be Inserted in Latter Copies he thinks this, that (as *Damascene* reports from either now lost Authors, or Oral traditions) *Melchi* was also called *Matthat*, as his other name, & so the blundering Transcribers Incerred, both as if they had denoted two different persons of *Levi*, he supposes, that upon report of *Melchi's* having a Son so called, some unskilful Writers thought the Account of *Josephs* Lineage could not be compleat without him, tho indeed (according to the acount I have already given) he did properly belong to *Mary's* Line and not to *Josephs*, which by both Evangelists is directly pursued.

Vers. 26. Concerning *Cainan* (after much rolling of thoughts on various opinions of the Learned) I take this for the best, and truest account. There were two Editions of the *Septuagint* Translation,

ation, both inserted by *Origen* in his *Hexapla* or six-fold-pillared Copy, in him the first and best Edition, hath no mention of *Cainan*, the second hath, but with an obelisck, or mark to intimate; that he judged it a Spurious Addition, this is attested by *Procopius* on *Gen* 11. In the after Editions of *Origens Hexapla* (to the Churches great loss) the Obelisks, and Asterisks *&c.* Were omitted, and so *Cainans* name passing without controversie, amongst such Writers as only considered the Latest, most common and least Correct Edition of the *Septuagint*, they thought the addition of it necessary, to fill up a supposed Blank in *St. Lukes* reckoning. This account is, considerably fortified by what *Beza* relates, *viz.* That some Manuscript Copie of St. *Luk's* Gospel omits *Cainan*, and particularly a very old One having most venerable marks of Antiquity in it, which belonged once to the to the Church of Lyons, & hath been since Transported to *Cambridge*.

Vers. 38. The calling of *Adam* the Son of God, because Created by his more immediat Hand, than the after generations of Mankind, makes a fair Step towards the belief of *Jesus*, his extraordinary Conception and Birth, for to give human Form to a dead and shapeless lump of Clay, and animat it with a Rational Soul, is equally hard Work, as to make a virgin conceive and bring forth without the help of a man.

I firmly persuade my self, that no objection can be urged against the accounts I have set down of this whole matter, to which I cannot give rational & satisfactory Answers, after the Pains I have taken, to consider all that is, or can be

well

well said on the Subject, and therefore, according to my promise, I shall conclude this Paper, with the extract of *Grotius*, his Tables, which will fill up the remainder of this sheet which (and no more) I design to fill up before I put Pen to work.

David.

Matth.	*Luke.*
Solomon	*Nathan*
Roboam	*Mattatha*
Abia	*Menan*
Asa	*Melea*
Josaphat	*Eliakim*
Joram	*Jonan*
Achazia, *Joas*, *Amasia* } omited	*Joseph*
	Juda
	Simeon
	Levi
Ozias qui & *Azarias*	*Matthan*
Joatham	*Jorim*
Achaz	*Eliezer*
Ezekias	*Jose*
Manasse	*Er*
Amon	*Elmodam*
Josias	*Cosam*
Jechonias, i. est *Jehoiakim*. *Addi*	

Jechonias alter sine Liberis mortuus. *Melchi* *Zedechias* Patruus & Hæres *Jechoniæ* posteriori *Neri*. *Assir* post *Zedechiam* *Jechoniæ* Hæres.

Salathiel,

Salathiel Neri *filius hæres* Assiris & Jechoniæ.
Zorobabel Salathielis *filius & hæres*.

Abiud
Eliakim
Azor
Sadoc
Achim
Eliud
Eliazer
Anonimus
Anonymus
Anonymus
Anonymus
Anonymus
Anonymus
Anonimus

Resa
Johanna
Juda
Joseph
Semei
Mantathias
Maath
Nagga
Elsi
Naum
Amos
Mattathias
Joseph
Janna

Matthæ prior maritus *Estbæ*, sine *Liberis* mortuus.

Melchi posterior maritus *Estbæ*, Pater naturalis *Jacobi*.

Jacob qui & *Panther Matthanis*, filius legalis ex *Estha*, frater *Elis* & *Levis* naturæ.

Fi Levi.

Barpanther.

Joseph filius *Eli* naturæ, *Jacobi* hæres *Mariæ* Agnatus proximus.

Panther.

Jehoiakim qui & *Eliakim*.

Idem *Levi Josephi* patruus

Maria Josepho Nupta.

Mariæ Abavus fuit.